

FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ARMENIAN LINGUISTICS: PROCEEDINGS

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHILADELPHIA
11-14, JULY 1979
SPONSORED BY
THE SOCIETY FOR ARMENIAN STUDIES

EDITED BY
JOHN A. C. GREPPIN
Program In Linguistics
Cleveland State University



CARAVAN BOOKS
DELMAR, NEW YORK
1980

THE ORIGIN OF ARM. z FROM IE **gh* AND **dh*

JOHN A. C. GREPPIN
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

This paper discusses the assumed Armenian z reflex of IE **gh* and **dh*. In many instances it is clear that the supposed Armenian word with z < **gh* is really a loan word from Iranian. In those instances where it has been proposed that IE **dh* > Arm. z, it seems more likely that none of the etymologies are valid.

Both IE **gh* and **dh* are said to be progenitors of Arm. z. Yet many of the etymologies cited are problematic; some imply Indo-European origin very clearly, others would seem to imply that Indo-European origin is unlikely and that the Armenian root is more likely of Iranian provenance; and finally, some of the suggested etymologies are entirely repugnant, the word being neither Indo-European or Iranian. This paper will review all instances where an original IE **gh* or **dh* has been aligned with an Arm. z, rejecting some correspondences and aligning other formerly Indo-European equations with Iranian instead.

According to Hübschmann and Meillet, IE **gh* passed to Arm. j and z. Arm. j is the normal reflex when IE **gh* is initial (Arm. jern 'hand', IE **gher-*), and when it is post-consonantal (Arm. barjr 'high', IE **bhrgh-*). Arm. z occurs elsewhere, always in post-vocalic position. However, the question has been raised about the sureness which we can ascribe to

all instances of Arm. z coming from IE *ǵh. Even Hübschmann himself (AG 474) acknowledged that Arm. mēz 'urine' could be as well an Iranian loan (Av. maēza-). Since then the question has been asked again, by Benveniste (1957.60), who felt that mēz was 'nettement' not of Indo-European origin, being rather an Iranian loan. He based this claim on the fact that, other than Arm. mēz, only Iranian shows a full grade form, and further, because only Armenian has preserved the nominal form alone (the verbal mizem is secondary). Another more compelling reinforcement not mentioned by Benveniste is found when noting the Greek cognate, ομύχλω 'to urinate', where we see clear evidence for an original *Omīǵh-, with a laryngeal. This laryngeal should necessarily have been reproduced in Armenian and its lack implicitly challenges the Indo-European-Armenian correspondence. It seems that we must disagree with Hübschmann's prime position, that Arm. mēz is of Indo-European origin, and instead accept his hesitant suggestion that mēz is an Iranian loan. Let us consider all those words in Armenian where a z has been derived from an IE *ǵh.

BAZUM 'much', Skt. bahú-, Gk. παχός, Hitt. panku, Lat. pinguis, IE *bhǵh-. Iranian cognates: Av. baž- 'width', dəbaž- 'sustain', Man. Sogd. ḍp'nz 'thick', Bal. bāz 'much' (archaic), bāz 'thick', Oss. bāzzyn 'become fit' (cf. Av. dəbaž-), bāznag 'thick', Wakhi bāj 'thick', Khotan Saka baysga 'thick'.

If IE *bhǵh- were to have been continued directly into Armenian, it would have appeared as *banj-, a point which Hübschmann noted, but ignored. This was perplexingly contradictory since he correctly considered Arm. bazuk 'forearm' as of Iranian origin. Arm. bazum is an Iranian loan, not Indo-European.

DĒZ 'pile, heap', DIZANEM 'to mass up', Av. daēz- 'to heap up', Gk. τείχος 'wall', Skt. deha- 'body', Osc. feihúss 'muros', Thrak. -ólos 'town', Goth. dāigs 'dough', Toch. A tseke- 'to fashion'. Iranian cognates: OP didā 'fortress', NP ju(diz), ju (diž), Phl. dēz 'id', Khotan Saka dāstā 'to heap up', Man. Sogd. prō'ys 'court', ḍyŕtk 'build'. No phonological rule makes this root more Iranian than Indo-European, but the close rapport of

the semantic value of the Armenian and the Iranian words imply Iranian origin, a view supported by Benveniste (1964.1-2) and seconded by Godel (1965.24).

EZN 'ox', Skt. ahī 'cow', Irish ag 'ox, cow', Welsh ael (< *aglo-). Iranian cognate: Av. azī- 'pregnant'. No clear Indo-European proto-type can be assigned though it would be either *eǵh- or *aǵh-. Bugge long ago suggested Caucasian origin (1893.83), noting Udi us (= yc Gukasyan 1974.214), Tabasaran unza, Lak nits, a point rejected by Meillet (1898.278) but raised again recently by Tumanian (1968.61) though without special emphasis. The word cannot be Iranian since the suffix -n cannot be attached to words other than those of Indo-European origin (Greppin 1975.111-112).

EZR 'shore', Lith. ėžeras, dialect āžeras 'sea', Azāgis 'name of a sea' (Būga 1959.508), Lett. ezers, Pruss. assaran 'lake', OCS (j)ezero 'sea'. The Baltic initial a- is probably secondary (Būga 1959.507-508), and the proto-form would be *eǵh-r-. Bolognesi (1978.205-206) points out that Arm. ezr usually refers to a lake shore rather than a river bank, and the sequence ezr covun is explicit and common. Arm. ezn cannot be Iranian.

LIZANEM 'lick', Skt. rédhi, lédhi 'licks', Gk. λείχω, Lat. lingo, Goth. bi-laigon, Lith. liēžti, Irish ligim, OCS lizati. Iranian cognates: Av. raēzaēte, Phl. lištan, listan, NP لیسیدن (lisidan), Kurd. listin, lixan, Khotan Saka rrīys-, Bud. Sogd. (inf.) rys'ty, Wakhi liṣ-, liṣetk, liṣt, Pashto līt 'smooth'. The principal obstacle to an Iranian loan is the lack of a z in a suitable Iranian cognate; instead we have š, s and x. However this alternation is common and z is part of the system:

NPer. xēz-ad 'rise up', inf. xās-tan (Av. pairi-xaēz-anuha 'id').

NPer. bāz-ad 'play', inf. bāxtan.

NPer. mēzad, inf. mēxtan, Phl. mīstan, mēxtan, mēzišn, mēšag

IE *meǵh- 'urine'.

NPer. ā-murzad, Kurd. mīstan 'sweep', NPer. frāmūšt.

Though it is clear that a root with Proto-Iranian *z, presumably from an earlier *ǵh, can also appear as s, š, x, and z, the

exact mechanisms that produce this diversity are not always clear. However, the alternation can also be seen in Avestan in such words as vazaiti 'go' (IE *weǵh-, Lat. veho) where we have the PPP vašta-, and an s- aorist in važ-. In view of the various Iranian reflexes of IE *ǵh in various positions, and in spite of the lack of a z in a Middle or New Persian reflexes of *leǵh-, an Iranian derivation (from PIranian *lēz-) is equally as likely as an Indo-European derivation.

MEZ 'urine', Gk. δμυξέω 'to urinate', Lat. mingere, Skt. méh-ati, Toch. B mišo. Iranian cognates: Av. maēz-, Zor. P. mēz, mist, gō-mēz, NPer. mēz, mēxtan, Bud. Sogd. myz'y, Oss. D. mezun, mist, Pashto mītel. The prothesis clearly marked in Gk. δμυξέω implies IE *Omeǵh- which would necessarily yield Arm. *amēz-. Arm. mēz must then be an Iranian loan word.

OZNI 'hedgehog', Gk. ἐχῖνος, Lith. ežys, OCS ježī, OHG igil, Pol. jeź, Russ. эх'id. Iranian Cognate: Oss. uzun. The possibility that Arm. ozni could come from Ossetic, by loan, is remote though possible: POSS. *ozon > Oss. uzun, Arm. ozni. But in spite of this possibility, Indo-European origin is more likely. Tumanian (1968:58) reminds us of Chechen zu which is possibly related somehow to this system.

TIZ 'tick', OIrish dega 'stagbeetle', PGerm. tīkan, OEng. ticia (for *tiica), MHG Zeche, NEng. tick (not tike). Though the Germanic forms imply an earlier *dig- rather than *digh-, we can compare NEng. lick from IE *leǵh-, perhaps the product of n gemination. However, it should be noted that all the cognates other than Armenian can stem from *tig-, and perhaps Armenian is not part of the correspondence (see Tumanian 1968:54).

Another cluster might be noted, *zǵh, which is said to be the root of Arm. mozi 'bullock', Gk. μόσχος 'young bull'; and Arm. azazim 'be dry', Goth. azgo 'ash'. Whether or not both of these etymologies are valid is not to the point since their origin is not precisely *ǵh.

To conclude the issue of Arm. z < *ǵh, we can make the following statements about the origin of the above eight words:

<u>Probably Iranian</u>	<u>Probably Indo-European</u>	<u>Either</u>
1. <u>bazum</u>	1. <u>ezn</u>	1. <u>lizanem</u>
2. <u>dēz</u>	2. <u>ezr</u>	2. <u>ozni</u>
3. <u>mēz</u>	3. <u>tiz</u> (?)	

The second problem is the hypothetical development of Arm. z from IE *dh, a shift which is said to occur only in post-vocalic position. Only one is noted by Hübschmann (azazim 'be dry' [AG 412]) and it is given within brackets, marking it as doubtful. Three others stem from the fertile imagination of Sophus Bugge (1890.79, 1893.38 [bis]) and a fifth is of uncertain parentage though listed in Pokorny (IEW). Only one of the etymologies is reasonable at first blush, and all crumble under close examination.

AZN 'nation, people'. This is frequently tied with Gk. ἔθνος, but initial original *e generally passes to Arm. a only in the environment of r (Greppin 1980). Arm. azn can be removed from the spectrum of direct Indo-European genesis by noting the following Iranian words (bearing in mind also azniu 'noble'): Khotan Saka āysnā- 'well born, noble', Av. āsna frazaintiš 'noble children', MPer. Turfan 'zn' 'n (= Sogdian āzātaq-t [āzāt 'free']), Zor. Pahl. āznāvar 'noble'; all from Bailey 1979.21. It appears simplest to regard Arm. azn 'nation', azniu 'noble' as an Iranian loan word, and not a reflex of IE *dh.

AZAZIM 'be dry'. Attempts to relate this word to Gk. ἄζω 'to dry', ἄσβολος 'ash', IE *azd(h)- are rejected by Hübschmann (AG). Djahukian (1967.218) also tries IE *azǵh-, but that too is not impressive.

AWAZ 'sand'. Gk. ἄμαθος, Lat. sabulum, OIce. sandr, MHG samt. Lat. sabulum can be accounted for by *bhsabh-los; Gk. φάμμος, from which ἄμμος arose (note also φάματος and ἄματος), can come from *bhsabh-mos; Germanic is derived from *bhsam-dho- < *bhsabh-dho-. It is difficult to derive Arm. awaz from any of these proto-types. Bolognesi (1978.199) however, feels that *sabh- would yield aw-, yet does not say what conformation will produce awaz. Perhaps *sabh-adh-? or *sabh-odh-? If so, what is our precedent?

ELUZANEM 'to extract', taken with Gk. ἔλθων 'I went', OIrish luid 'he went'; here the semantic barrier is uncrossable.

Another correlation with Skt. ródhati 'grow' is equally unsettling (Scheftelowitz 1902.299-300).

SOYZ 'an immersion', SUZEM 'sink'. Taken with Gk. κεύθω 'cover, hide', and clearly questionable on a semantic level.

It appears that we must side with Godel, who says (1975. 130) that the development of IE *dh to Arm. z is unlikely. The cornerstone to the correspondence was Arm. azn, Gk. ἄννος; once this is removed by reference to an Iranian provenance, the whole series collapses from the weight of root etymology. The only source of Arm. z is from a post-vocalic *gh.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, Harold W.

- 1979 Dictionary of Khotan Saka, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Benveniste, É.

- 1957 "Mots d'emprunt iraniens en arménien", BSL 53.55-71.
1964 "Éléments parthes en arménien", REArm 1.1-39.

Bolognesi, G.

- 1978 "Contributo allo studio della più antica terminologia marinaresca armena e dei suoi rapporti con quella delle altre lingue indeuropee", Bollettino dell' Atlante linguistico Mediterraneo, 91-209.

Būga, Kazys.

- 1959 "Замечания и дополнения к этимологическому словарю русского языка, А. преображенского", in Rinktiniai Raštai II, Vilnius, Valstybinė, pp. 499-694. (First appeared 1918?)

Bugge, S.

- 1890 Etruskisch und Armenisch, Christiania, H. Aschehoug.
1893 "Beiträge zur etymologischen erläuterung der armenischen sprache", KZ 32.1-87.

Djahukian, G. B. (Джаукян, Г. Б.)

- 1967 Очерки по истории дописьменного периода армянского языка, Ереван, Изд. Ак. Н.

Godel, Robert

- 1965 "Les origines de la conjugaison arménienne", REArm 2.21-41.
1975 An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian, Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Greppin, J. A. C.

- 1975 Classical Armenian Nominal Suffixes, A Historical Study, Vienna, Mechitharisten-Buchdruckerei.
1980 "A Note on the Alternation of e and a in Classical Armenian", Annual of Armenian Linguistics I.

Gukasyan, V. (Гукасян, В.)

- 1974 Удинча-азербайджанча-русча дугер, Баку, "Елм".

Meillet, A.

- 1898 "Étymologies arméniennes", MSL 10.274-282. Reprinted in Meillet 1977.39-47.
1977 Études de linguistique et de philologie arméniennes, Louvaine, Imprimerie Orientaliste.

Scheftelowitz, J.

- 1902 "Zur altarmenischen lautgeschichte", BB 28.282-313.